REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 1-7 are allowable, claims 15, 16, 18, and 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and claims 20-27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the §112, second paragraph rejection.

Claims 1-7, 14-28, and 30 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 14, 17, 19, 28, and 30 presently stand rejected. Claims 20 and 28 are amended herein. Claim 29 is hereby cancelled without prejudice. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants hereby affirm the March 29, 2004 oral election of group I (claims 1-7 and 14-30) without traverse. Applicants hereby cancel non-elected claims 8-13 without prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner requested that the phrase "sending an interrupt request signal, after entering the interrupt mode, to the host device in response to the interrupt data" be amended to recite, "after entering the interrupt mode, sending an interrupt request signal to the host device in response to the interrupt data." Accordingly, claim 20 has been amended as requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 14, 17, 19, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No5,958,020 to Evoy et al. (hereinafter "Evoy").

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended independent claim 14 now recites, in pertinent part,

14. A **client device, comprising**:
a serial bus port ... to be coupled to a **host device**; and
an interrupt logic element ... to indicate to the **client device** to enter an interrupt mode in response to the interrupt logic element receiving a set interrupt mode signal.

Applicants respectfully submit that Evoy fails to disclose a "client device" having an interrupt logic element as recited above. The Examiner cites any of devices 114, 116, 118 as corresponding to Applicants claimed "client device" and computer system 122 as corresponding to Applicants claimed host device, but cites RAM 106 (see FIG. 1) as corresponding to the interrupt logic element. However, claim 14 recites a "client device, **comprising** ... an interrupt logic element..." FIG. 1 of Evoy fails to disclose any of devices 114, 116, and 118 as including an interrupt logic element and RAM 106 is clearly illustrated as part of computer system 122.

Furthermore, Evoy discloses "[i]t should be appreciated that this "USB interrupt" refers to an interrupt data packet which is **transmitted to the USB controller the next time light gun 116 is polled** and is not to be confused with conventional, hardware supported, CPU interrupts." *Evoy*, col. 7, lines 43-47. Thus, Evoy discloses light gun 116 transmitting interrupt data in response to being polled by the USB controller. However, Evoy fails to disclose light gun 116 entering an interrupt mode in response to receiving a set interrupt mode signal.

Consequently, Evoy fails to disclose each and every element of claim 14, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Accordingly, Applicants kindly request that the instant §102 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 28 now recites, in pertinent part, "withholding transmission of a start of frame packet from the host device after sending the set interrupt mode signal for at least a time period equal to a frame duration..." **Claim 28 now includes the subject matter of claim 29 indicated by the Examiner as allowable.**

Dependent claims 17, 19, and 30 are novel over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants

respectfully request that the instant § 102 rejections for claims 17, 19, and 30 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

ll May

Date: ~~April~~ 7, 2004

Cory G. Claassen
Reg. No. 50,296
Phone: (206) 292-8600